

Attachment 12 Evaluation Results

This summary was taken from a total of 82 evaluations. Not all participants answered every question, leaving some totals short of 82. The comments have been transcribed verbatim, with the exception of removing names of recipients of negative feedback.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Overall, this Summit was a good use of my time.	31	43	3	1	
2. We had a useful exchange of ideas and information about important Solid Waste issues.	32	46	3		
3. I am coming away with a greater understanding of links among the local plans, the State plan and the CPG program.	15	39	24	2	
4. We did a good job of evaluating the CPG goals.	15	47	14	2	
5. We did a good job of identifying priority issues to work on in the coming years.	29	42	8		
6. The meeting facilities and accommodations were fine.	23	50	9	1	
7. The meeting facilitators kept us on track and working together.	41	38	1		
8. We made progress towards improving our partnerships during this Summit.	23	47	10		

9. Best times for the 2006 Summit, in order of preference:

1. June 1-15 (32)
2. Any of these times: (14)
3. October 16-31 (13)
4. May 1-15 (13)

5. October 1-15 (12)
6. May 16-31 (12)

10. What were the best parts of the Summit?

- The networking both with similar colleagues and with health department employees.
- Organization/food/facilitators (professional).
- Hearing first-hand what people were thinking about.
- The Summit was well organized in general. Representation from all areas, agencies was very good. Participation by all was very good. Facilitators were very good.
- Exchange of information. Opportunities to discuss issues with health district folks.
- Networking. Validation of common goals.
- Partnering/collaborating to go over goals (small groups).
- Process going from info sharing to goals progressed ____[?] well. List of priorities. The magician was good.
- Getting to know people/photo bios. Magician. Chance to integrate CPG goals and Beyond Waste. Seeing mostly support for Beyond Waste.
- Informal discussion of topics that occurred at the end of the organized sessions.
- All were informative. I learned a great deal. Enjoyed networking. Great breakout groups.
- Facilitators/groups keeping things moving. Food/entertainment. Start time of Noon on first day. Photo bio a good idea.
- Close contact and communication.
- Chance to address issues with out partnerships. Chance to meet and talk to people from around the state.
- Group discussions and breakout sessions.
- Meals together; meeting new friends and seeing old colleagues.
- Small group discussions, table discussions.
- Networking- exposure to peers in other jurisdictions and elsewhere within WDOE.
- Networking- understanding of common issues and goals across the state.
- Talking with a variety of participants.
- Working with small groups by color and work background. Meeting others of like interest.
- Meeting others.
- Well organized. Kept on track and on schedule. Well facilitated.
- Tabletop discussions/sessions.
- The goal breakout session is where the best discussion occurred.
- Meeting all the people.
- Personal interactions. Hearing views from across the state.

- Groups getting together.
- Small groups, table discussions.
- The fathering of such extraordinary people in the field. Table exercises were good.
- Hearing from small counties. Discussion groups- but at the ones in the big room it was hard to hear what people were saying.
- Networking. Good at strengthening relationships. Combining P.W. and JHD in the same meeting. Good facilitation. Good exchange of ideas.
- Group workshops, talked good solid waste issues.
- Networking.
- Networking, chance to really discuss issues with folks of opposing view.
- Cullen's singing. Networking- hard work, but I feel like we actually accomplished some objectives.
- Organization, always moving forward, positive attitude by all. Networking.
- Networking and entertainment.
- Networking/opportunity to meet colleagues from around the state and discuss our issues.
- Photo bio. Cullen's singing, magician, watching [people] bond. Discussions of goals- getting on same page as locals. Bonding on a social level.
- Being part of the decision-making process. Hearing all sides.
- Open discussions of issues by diverse group: effective in quickly identifying priority issues.
- Breakout sessions and small group discussions.
- The time to share and network- hearing varied viewpoints from agencies.
- Exchange ideas with peer and partners.
- Interaction in the small discussion groups.
- Learning more about CPG. Meeting people from other areas and disciplines who are all involved in the same issues. Most importantly, being involved in the process.
- Well thought out and adherence to agenda. Consultants kept group interested and active.
- Group discussion/participation/sharing of ideas.
- Meeting other agencies' staff both local and state from all over the state. Right amount of lecture and group interaction. Discussion and plenty of opportunity for input.
- Getting to meet a lot of local government staff. Relationship building. The magic show. The photo bio. Jointly developing goals. Fun with friends.
- Meeting staff from around the state and hearing other interests, perspectives.
- Meeting others; better understanding of PW and PH interaction. Opportunities for discussion with others.
- The opportunity to meet and dialogue with more people. Photo bio exercise.
- Round table discussions.

- Interaction with participants.
- Well planned and facilitated. Magic shows were great break with a good message slipped in. Small group discussions with plenty of time to get meaningful work done.
- Getting to talk with others in the waste management profession and hear perspectives, hopes, gripes.
- A conference summit like this is a great battery-charger. Thanks to all the planners who set the summit up to run so smoothly.
- Knowing there will be further chances to review goals and polish them.
- Networking.
- Discussions during and after meetings.
- Meeting counterparts.
- Networking.
- Seeing folks again, meeting new people and sharing ideas.
- Working among a lot of stakeholders to coordinate future actions and prioritize most important/consensus issues.

11. What would you like to see changed/improved for the next Summit?

- ¼ of the attendees were DOE employees and I felt that was a bit top heavy.
- Different location, preferably in Central or Eastern Washington.
- Keep it down to one really long day or two days.
- More detail as to what has been effective around the state and what has not worked.
- It was great- good scope, well focused.
- A little more time for unstructured networking.
- Annual mini-summits that are eastside/Westside based would enhance the biennial summits. Email list of attendees is kept alive and used to share/disseminate info from the CPG workgroup, clearinghouse, etc. Two-day summit- if we need to add an evening session that's ok. Bring a report of how government is implementing Beyond Waste (state agencies, local agencies).
- Parking and access to conference rooms.
- Maybe more mixing of participants for the group discussions to get to know more people and make contacts.
- A structured social time.
- Not sure.
- A clearer purpose for the summit.
- No box lunches. Air conditioning in my dorm room. 2 days only.
- Look at agenda to make sure time matches agenda.
- Request jurisdictions to send representatives that can deal with issues on a high level. Groups were held up, the entire attendance at times, to deal with minutia from 3-4 counties [names withheld]. Bring broader (big picture) capacity to a "Summit," not small thinkers. "Anal" thinking was not the issue of DOE, but

other participants. Other than that, excellent work. It was a rewarding experience.

- Don't start so early in the day- 8:30 to 8:45. More frequent and minimum 15 minute breaks during the day.
- Not on a campus.
- Venue and accommodations- prefer a retreat-type setting or a not-too-expensive hotel.
- Might be nice to showcase innovative programs (CPG funded or otherwise) with short (5-10 minute) presentations interspaced through the Summit.
- Have it in 2 full days with more breaks- it was a very tight schedule, but it was also effective.
- 2 days only and not at CWU (hotel rooms suck)
- N/A- Nothing comes to mind.
- Panel discussions.
- Don't try to improve a formula that already works (or worked) so well.
- My brain was full after day two. Maybe more shorter breaks? And two long days as opposed to three.
- Not much. I thought we, as a group, made a lot of progress. When I think of the very first summit the positive changes, open dialogue has been great in comparison.
- More prep work done with health departments. Their "goals" needed more discussion and focus before the Summit. There was a sense that some missed the mark or were irrelevant.
- An inspirational speaker to kick off the Summit- maybe from another area/specialty who doesn't use jargon but has a message we all understand. Organized social (good for new people), later dinner (6-6:30), water (pitchers), coffee at all times!
- No pictures! Would liked to have seen a breakdown of 2004-2005 CPG grant amounts to health districts, amounts to public works, amounts under each category (SWE, WRR, SQGI, etc.).
- Longer time for breaks.
- I think the Summit could have been accomplished in 2 days.
- Make it 2 days, not 3.
- Better chairs; some outside time; add group singing, some poetry, some art?
- Summit materials to be available a little earlier before Summit.
- Less or no separation of Public Works and JHD staff. More prep or advance material provided in advance of the Summit; this may allow for more focused and productive discussions. Opportunity for smaller group discussions- either on specific topics or by WDOE region, etc. Much more discussion regarding evaluation, program measurement, environmental outcomes, etc.
- JLARC representation sorely needed.
- Shorten Summit!

- Start registration process earlier- well in advance.
- Rotation of group members. Meet more people!
- Better meeting space. Geographic location was fine.
- No box lunches- too much waste, too little protein. 2 days, not 3.
- Try to diversify speakers. Cullen and Jeff did well, but a JLARC rep would have been nice.
- For small groups- facilitators should be folks that have intimate knowledge of topics discussed in order to help formulate ideas (capture ideas).
- The CPG goal discussions should not be broken into groups separating health and public works.
- Ideas for small counties with small staff, with lower populations to be able to implement and fund new programs. I know none of us can foresee spending more time than this on a summit but the schedule felt so aggressive that many discussions were cut short. Maybe we will make more efforts to connect in between summits and discussion will be continuous.
- Venue for meeting- lighting, etc. More breaks. Sound system. Food- too cheesy for vegetarians.
- More upfront time with Cullen [From Cullen's evaluation]

12. Other comments?

- I did not appreciate [an Ecology staff person's] defensive attitude in our working group. [He/she] seemed to take remarks about DOE too personally.
- Facilitation of CPG goals didn't work efficiently until after lunch- but then good. Dee did great. Thanks!
- CPG workgroup process explanation would have been a good addition for the CPG goal workshop day. Maybe that will be irrelevant for the next summit but... who knows?
- Water with snacks would be nice. Would like report summary on summit. Highlighted map for meeting locations.
- Mini-summits within each region of the state semi-annually.
- Well done.
- Small breakout sessions- too much sidebar talking. Facilitator was somewhat oppressive in order to keep us on task (but good at keeping on task). Facilitator not able to extract info from people as comments (some good ideas lost because not captured). Intent from ideas lost in translations.
- Try to condense a bit more. It was hard to be away for 3 days. If we meet every 2 years, a shorter summit should work (unless its at Maui).
- Table discussions were better than the breakout rooms, mostly because the breakouts were a little large and rooms not very comfortable. Great facilitators and organized well!
- Very well organized and facilitated.
- Thanks to our wonderful facilitators!

- Dee was an excellent facilitator! Thanks!
- Excellent discussions- many viewpoints- everyone listened and communicated effectively- very well done!! Great facilitators- Dee did a great job!
- Good choice of location.
- Much of material seemed vague and hard to clearly characterize operationally.
- I think the breakout groups should not have been split into PW/JHDs, the groups should have been mixed.
- Group Dynamics [Agreement Dynamics?] did an excellent job.
- Coffee would help during sessions.
- Very well organized. I am new to this job but was able to understand what was going on. Everything was explained well. Thanks for the magic show!
- I thought the location really worked. CWU did a great job with the food. Not typical college food. Would have been nice to have cereal/yoghurt, etc. for breakfast. The Munson rooms were actually pretty nice (much better than the rooms in the big tower). Good idea to have pre-assigned seating. Like the photo bio idea.
- Great Summit.
- I felt this was and is a great venue for understanding and compromise but think we still must work more on trust and understanding each other's point of view or position (speaking strictly from a county point of view).
- I enjoyed the energy of the facilitators and the voting on hot topics seemed to work well.
- Best conference I've been to in years.
- Facilitators did a great job! Food was good. Need to organize extra curricular activities.
- Great job Kristen!
- The process was good in that it allowed all to be involved. It also gets input you would never get just sending out surveys or questions.
- Not enough time to comment on and discuss draft goals. Not enough time to come up with new goals.
- Need bottled water other than soda.
- Well planned. Well facilitated. Agenda moved/flowed smoothly.
- Good facilitation. Good planning- good job, Kristen!
- Great job with making everyone feel welcome.
- The pictured biography sheets were fun and good way to help people get to know each other- foster partnerships.
- Why was the Ecology HWTR program not represented? The Beyond Waste initiative for small volume hazardous waste will only be stronger if the HWTR program is brought into statewide gatherings like this. Small group discussions would also have been enhanced.
- Great job! Thank you for your hard work.
- Food was adequate; water would have been nice. Very good organization.

- I think the CPG workgroup generated too many goals. It will be unmanageable to have so many goals. I think the goals under each topic area should be condensed into fewer, general mega-goals.
- Good work!